UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,300	01/22/2002	Srinivas Mandyam	2102299-991130	2017

29906	7590	01/25/2006

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C.
7150 E. CAMELBACK, STE. 325
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 November 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 13-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 13-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 11/09/2005 to the

original application filed 01/22/2002.

2.   Claims 1-10 and 13-18 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 10 have

been amended. Claims 11-12 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 10 are independent

claims.

Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b),by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2)a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a)shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)of such treaty in the English language; or " (Emphasis added.)

4.   Claims 1-4 and 6-9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Chau**

et al. (US 6,721,727, filed 11/2000).

<u>As to claim 1</u>

Chau teaches *(see the Abstract)* a computer-based *(e.g., a computer)* method for

extracting content from a document *(e.g., XML documents)*, comprising the step of:

(a)   creating set of selection envelopes *(e.g., create SQL queries; col.10, lines 48-49)* ,

wherein each selection envelop is associated with at least one selection command

for locating a particular portion of the content within the document *(e.g., XML*

element contents or attributes values extracted from XML document ... data type

of an element or attribute can be specified, searches can be performed on SQL

general data type and range searches can be performed; col.24, lines 49-58),

wherein each selection command is a function configure to locate *(e.g., the use of*

SELECT command) the particular portion of the content to be enclosed by a

corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command

narrows *(e.g., the use of WHERE command)* the content to be enclosed by the

selection envelope corresponding to the selection command *(see the SQL*

discussion beginning at col.23, line 35; col.25, line 5 & col. 43, line 4);

(b)   applying each selection command and its corresponding selection envelope to the

content until the specific content from the document is enclosed *(e.g., Sriram*

Srinivasan) in a particular one *(e.g.; sales_tab)* of the selection envelopes *(see the*

SQL discussion beginning at col.23, line 35; col.25, line 5 & col. 43, line 4).

As to claim 2

Chau teaches *(col.26, lines 5-9)* begin marker *(sales-tab)* and an end marker *(>2500.00)*,

which respectively define the beginning and end of the selection envelope.

As to claim 3

Chau teaches *(col.43, lines 42-45)* a parent envelope *(e.g., SELECT clause)* and a child

envelope *(e.g., WHERE clause)*.

As to claim 4

Chau teaches the child envelope is nested within the parent envelope *(e.g., SELECT ...*

SELECTING DISTINCT; col.26, lines 51-54).

As to claim 6

Chau teaches the child envelope is completely outside of the parent envelope *(col.38,*

lines 15-40).

As to claim 7

Chau teaches a command based on the document structure *(e.g., XML query parameter;*

col. 40, lines 48-65).

As to claim 8

Chau teaches a command based on a character pattern (e.g., *SQL query; col.38, lines 50-*

67).

As to claim 9

Chau teaches *(col.38, lines 40-47)* a combined command *(e.g., define mapping ... XML*

document using SQL mapping) based on both document structure (e.g., *XML)* and a

character pattern (e.g., *SQL).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if
the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would*

have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6.   Claims 10 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Chau et al.

As to claim 10

a.   The rejection of independent claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full.

b.   Chau does not explicitly teach *"determining whether the first content is the*

desired content; extracting the first content if the first content is the desired

content; defining a child selection envelope corresponding to the second

command for locating second content within the content source if the first content

is not said desired content; using the second selection command associated with

the child selection command to select the second content from the content

resource; determining whether the second content is the desired content; and

extracting the second content if the second content is the desired content."

c.   However, Chau suggests *(e.g., Suppose there are more than 1000 XML*

documents stored...the WHERE clause did the filtering on the collection of 1000

XML documents; col.24, lines 20-47).

d.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to applied Chau's suggestion to implement the features as

claimed Chau because it would have provided the capability for locating a desired

content stored in a table created in a rational database management system.

As to claim 13

Chau teaches a document *(e.g., XML document; col.6, line 10).*

As to claim 14

Chau teaches a section of a document *(e.g., the XML documents… multiple pieces; col.7,*

lines 5-7).

As to claim 15

Chau teaches determining whether the source is structure *(e.g., XML document … a tree*

structure; col.44, lines 20-21) or unstructured, and selecting the at least one selection

command is based upon this determination *(e.g., SQL query; col.44, lines 37-38).*

As to claim 16

Chau teaches structure based command selected from, among other things, select by

attribute commands *(e.g., SQL query and maps the data obtained from the SQL query*

into elements and attributes; col.35, lines 51-53).

As to claim 17

Chau teaches a character based command selected from, among other things, select text

matching pattern commands *(col.38, line 40-col.39, line 45).*

As to claim 18

It includes the same limitations as in claim 9, and is similarly rejected under the same

rationale.

7.   Claims 5 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chau et al.**
in view of **Coppperman et al.** (U.S. 6,711,585 – filed 06/2000).

As to claim 5

a.   Chau does not explicitly teach *"the child envelope partially overlaps the parent
envelope."*

b.   Coppperman teaches the child envelope partially overlaps the parent envelope
(col.23, lines 54-67).

c.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to include the feature from Coppperman in the system of
Chau because it would have provided the capability for eliminating the concept-
node from the input set an to re-initiate the knowledge map generation
mechanism.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/09/2005 have been fully considered but they are not
persuasive.

Applicant argued that *Chau does not teach creating set of selection envelopes, wherein
each selection envelop is associated with at least one selection command for locating a
particular portion of the content within the document, wherein each selection command
is a function configure to locate the particular portion of the content to be enclosed by a*

corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows

the content to be enclosed by the selection envelope corresponding to the selection

command; and applying each selection command and its corresponding selection

envelope to the content until the specific content from the document is enclosed in a

particular one of the selection envelopes (Remarks, page 7).

In response, Chau teaches creating set of selection envelopes *(e.g., create SQL queries;*

col.10, lines 48-49), wherein each selection envelop is associated with at least one

selection command for locating a particular portion of the content within the document

(e.g., XML element contents or attributes values extracted from XML document ... data

type of an element or attribute can be specified, searches can be performed on SQL

general data type and range searches can be performed; col.24, lines 49-58), wherein

each selection command is a function configure to locate *(e.g., the use of SELECT*

command) the particular portion of the content to be enclosed by a corresponding

selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows *(e.g., the use of*

WHERE command) the content to be enclosed by the selection envelope corresponding to

the selection command *(see the SQL discussion beginning at col.23, line 35; col.25, line*

5 & col. 43, line 4); and applying each selection command and its corresponding

selection envelope to the content until the specific content from the document is enclosed

(e.g., Sriram Srinivasan) in a particular one *(e.g., sales_tab)* of the selection envelopes

(see the SQL discussion beginning at col.23, line 35; col.25, line 5 & col. 43, line 4).

Applicant argued *that Chau does not teach defining a child selection envelope corresponding to the second command for locating second content within the content source if the first content is not said desired content; using the second selection command associated with the child selection command to select the second content from the content resource; determining whether the second content is the desired content; and extracting the second content if the second content is the desired content* (Remarks, page 11).

In response, Applicant simply points out what is broadly recited in claim 10 and asserts that "Chau reference fails to teach…as required by claim 10". This quote is the extent of explanation provided by Applicant in support of claim 10. This response by Applicant is insufficient to satisfy the requirement of specific argument to have the claims considered for patentability; in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Applicant must distinctly and specifically point out "how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references". However, the rejection above clarifies how Chau meet the claim limitations as amended by Applicant.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gupta et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,826,258	issued: Oct. 20, 1998
Madnick et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,913,214	issued: Jun. 15, 1999
Van Eaton et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,948,117	issued: Sep. 20, 2005

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact information

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30

pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1/20/2006